

REMARKS

The Examiner has grouped the pending claims into eight species. Further, the Examiner contends that there are subspecies on several of the individual pieces of the invention.

Applicants traverse the requirement for restriction since the essence of all of the claims is a single invention of which all of the claims are part and parcel of the application. Further, the mere classification of some of the claims in different species and subspecies is an artificial division which should not be determinative. Applicants accordingly request reversal of the restriction requirement.


In view of the Examiner's requirement to select a group for further prosecution should the opposition to restriction not prevail, applicants elect Species A (Figures 1a-d, 2); holding element Subspecies A (Figures 3a-3c); and use of a key Subspecies C (Figures 12a-12d), claims 30, 31, 34-39, 41, 42, 53, and 54, for further prosecution in this case.

Regarding the specification, the Examiner required correction of certain informalities. Such informalities are addressed by the above amendments.

Regarding the drawings, the Examiner required correction of certain informalities. Replacement sheets containing the amendments described above are enclosed herewith.

An early action on the merits of these claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Eugene LeDonne
Reg. No. 35,930
Joseph W. Treloar
Reg. No. 60,975
Joseph Miller, III
Reg. No. 61,748

REED SMITH LLP
599 Lexington Avenue
29th Floor
New York, NY 10022
(P) 212-521-5400
Attorney for Applicant